

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

**I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

Claim 10 is cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claim 1 is amended herein.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-9 are currently pending and under consideration in the present application.

**II. OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS**

In item 1, on page 2 of the Office Action, the drawings are "objected to." The Examiner indicates that reference numbers "500, 600" recited in FIG. 6 are not mentioned in the specification. Reference numbers "500, 600" have been changed to reference number "201a." In view of the attached "Replacement Sheet" of FIG. 6, the outstanding drawing objection should be resolved.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the objection is overcome.

**III. OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION**

In item 2, on page 2 of the Office Action, the specification is "objected to." The specification is amended herein to overcome the objection.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the objection is overcome.

**IV. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 AND 2 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY UCHANSKI ET AL. (USP# 3,847,324)**

The present invention as recited in claim 1 (as amended herein), relates to a saucer to hold various kinds of cups and to be used with a saucer holder provided on a microwave oven. The saucer comprises a cup seating part having a disc shape and engaging part to removably engage with the saucer holder provided on the microwave oven.

Uchanski discloses a nontipping, disposable dishware having a cup 13 and an improved plate 16. However, nothing in Uchanski discloses that the plate 16 is provided on a microwave oven like the claimed saucer holder, which is provided on the microwave oven as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Uchanski does not disclose or suggest the features as recited in claim 1 of the

present invention.

Further, the Examiner indicates that the phrase "provided on the microwave oven" is broadly given weight. However, it appears that the claimed feature, "the saucer holder provided on the microwave oven," has not been given any weight because the feature is neither disclosed nor suggested by the teachings of Uchanski. In fact, there is no explicit, implicit, or inherent teaching of a saucer holder provided on a microwave oven in the Uchanski reference. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference" (see MPEP § 2131).

Claim 2 depends from claim 1. Thus, for at least the reason that claim 1 distinguishes over the cited prior art, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 also distinguishes over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**V. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 3, 5-7 AND 9 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY MORGAN (USP# 5,873,486)**

Morgan discloses a selectively mountable cup holder. The Examiner indicates that Morgan discloses a mounting surface in column 2, line 23.

However, there is nothing in the Morgan reference that discloses that the mounting surface is provided on a microwave oven like the claimed saucer holder, which is provided on the microwave oven as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Morgan does not disclose or suggest the features as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

The comments in the third paragraph of section IV above, also apply here.

Claims 3, 5-7 and 9 depend from claim 1. Thus, for at least the reasons that claim 1 distinguishes over the cited prior art, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3, 5-7 and 9 also distinguish over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**VI. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 3, 5-7 AND 9 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY McBRIDE (USP# 5,186,350)**

McBride discloses an insulated beverage container holder. The Examiner indicates that McBride discloses a mounting surface S and fasteners 54 and 56 (see column 4, lines 5-7).

However, there is nothing in the McBride reference that discloses that the mounting surface S is provided on a microwave oven like the claimed saucer holder, which is provided on

the microwave oven as recited in claim 1. Therefore, McBride does not disclose or suggest the features as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

The comments in the third paragraph of section IV above, also apply here.

Claims 3, 5-7 and 9 depend from claim 1. Thus, for at least the reasons that claim 1 distinguishes over the cited prior art, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3, 5-7 and 9 also distinguish over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**VII. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 3, 5 AND 6 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY WEMYSS (USP# 6,305,656)**

Wemyss discloses a beverage cup holder 12 magnetically coupled to a magnetic base 14. However, nothing in the Wemyss reference discloses that the magnetic base 14 is provided on a microwave oven like the claimed saucer holder, which is provided on the microwave oven as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Wemyss does not disclose or suggest the features as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

The comments in the third paragraph of section IV above, also apply here.

Claims 3, 5 and 6 depend from claim 1. Thus, for at least the reasons that claim 1 distinguishes over the cited prior art, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3, 5 and 6 also distinguish over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**VIII. REJECTION OF CLAIM 4 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER McBRIDE OR WEMYSS IN VIEW OF THOMASON (USP# 5,102,086)**

The comments in section VI and VII above, also apply here because claim 4 depends from claim 1. Thus, for at least the reasons that claim 1 distinguishes over the cited prior art, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 also distinguishes over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**IX. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 7-10 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER WEMYSS IN VIEW OF McBRIDE**

The comments in section VI and VII above, also apply here because claims 7-9 depend from claim 1. Thus, for at least the reasons that claim 1 distinguishes over the cited prior art, it is respectfully submitted that claims 7-9 also distinguish over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**X. CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 9-14-04

By: Derrick L. Fields  
Derrick L. Fields  
Registration No. 50,133

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

In item 1, on page 2 of the Office Action the drawings are objected to. In order to overcome the objection, a replacement FIG. 6 is submitted herewith. In FIG. 6, the reference numbers "500, 600" have been changed to reference number "201a." Approval of the changes to the drawing is respectfully requested.